United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.21

General Assembly
Fiftieth session

Official Records

First Committee
21st Meeting
Wednesday, 15 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.12: Paraguay;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Cape Verde, Cyprus and Latvia;

A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand and Norway;

A/C.1/50/L.31: Australia and Brunei Darussalam;

A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1: Bhutan, El Salvador and Guatemala;

A/C.1/50/L.45: Djibouti, Liechtenstein and Tunisia;

A/C.1/50/L.48: the Islamic Republic of Iran and Malaysia; and

A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2: Australia, the Marshall Islands and Monaco.

The Chairman: As representatives may recall, last night we were not able to finish the list of speakers. The first order of business today will be for delegations to continue to speak in explanation of vote or position after the vote on cluster 1.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Pakistan abstained in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, on "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

Although we appreciate the progress that has been made in the bilateral nuclear negotiations between the United States and the Russian Federation, we felt that the draft resolution was deficient in two respects. In its seventh preambular paragraph, the General Assembly would express appreciation of the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Pakistan is not a party to the NPT. In any event, the indefinite extension has been questioned, even by some parties to the NPT.

Secondly, we feel that the progress in nuclear disarmament made in negotiations held outside the single multilateral negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament, should be reported to the Conference, which should be responsible for negotiating a phased programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

While I am speaking, may I take this opportunity to respond briefly to the statements made yesterday by the representative of the European Union and Australia, explaining their votes on the draft resolution on security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1.

95-86666 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

It was stated by the representative of the European Union that this draft resolution did not reflect the latest developments. We believe that this is not a correct evaluation. The draft resolution notes Security Council resolution 984 (1995) as well as the views expressed on it.

The paragraphs relating to the results of the NPT Conference were discussed by my delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors, with the delegation of Australia. It is unfortunate that our dialogue was left incomplete by the other side. This has now been used as justification for abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution.

We must state at this moment that we cannot accept the proposition that security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be made conditional on their acceptance of the NPT or other non-proliferation treaties. It is our view, which we have consistently expressed, that the nuclear-weapon States have an obligation to provide security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States because of their possession of nuclear weapons —

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I apologize to the representative of Pakistan, but under rule 128 of the rules of procedure, I believe that it is improper for you, Sir, to allow explanations of votes by proposers of resolutions.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I wish that the representative of the United States had heard what I was saying a little more clearly than he evidently did. I concluded my remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 and then stated that I wished to respond to the statements made by the European Union and Australia. I have the right to reply to a statement that was made in this discussion and I am exercising that right. I would urge representatives to exercise some self-restraint in hearing the positions of other delegations with which, perhaps, they do not agree.

As I was saying, it is our view that the nuclear-weapon States have an obligation to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of nuclear weapons. This obligation flows from the very possession of nuclear weapons because, we believe, weapons of mass destruction should be prohibited.

Many members of the European Union have, for many years, enjoyed the assurances of one or more nuclear-weapon States under their alliance arrangements. These assurances were provided them even before the NPT was formulated or came into force. They were not illegal because of that. They flowed from Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

As regards our friends from Australia, there was a long period of time before Australia ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We wonder whether Australia felt that, during this period when it was not a party to the NPT, it was legitimate for nuclear-weapon States to hold out the threat of nuclear weapons against Australia.

All those who have spoken along these lines should ponder very carefully the consequences of the proposition that security assurances should be restricted to those States that are parties to the NPT.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): The Egyptian delegation would like to explain why it abstained in the vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1. Egypt abstained on that paragraph because the word "Appreciating" with which it begins is not consonant with the letter of the statement delivered by the delegation of Egypt on the adoption of the decision in question at last May's Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Sukontasap (Thailand): I wish to explain Thailand's vote yesterday afternoon on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". My delegation wishes to place on record that Thailand has no objection to the overall idea of that draft resolution. However, we felt obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, as we believe that it does not adequately reflect the sentiment of the international community on this important subject. We believe that the majority of States would wish to see a time-bound framework for the elimination of the nuclear threat, and that the Conference on Disarmament should be allowed to play a greater role in nuclear disarmament negotiations.

Mr. Jusuf (Indonesia): I wish to explain the Indonesian delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". While we agree with the general thrust of the text, we note that wording to the effect that the primary responsibility rests with the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those which possess the largest stockpiles, is conspicuous by its absence. Members

may recall that this notion was explicitly reflected both in resolution 49/75 L, sponsored by the Non-Aligned Movement and adopted by consensus, and in resolution 49/75 P, sponsored by the United States, the Russian Federation and a number of other States, both of which we strongly supported.

Its omission in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 is thus inexplicable, to say the least, for it stands to reason and is logical that only States possessing nuclear weapons must bear the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament; this must be emphasized.

I turn now to the fourth preambular paragraph, which stresses the importance of strengthening international peace and security through general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. While we recognize the significance of this concept and approach, the absence in this paragraph of a reference to the need to achieve nuclear disarmament as the immediate and overriding goal detracts from the spirit of the draft resolution. It is also incompatible with the determined view of an overwhelming majority of the international community in their quest for a world without the menace of nuclear weapons.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I had intended to respond to the statement of the representative of Pakistan, who seemed to think that the fact that he had spoken to the Australian Ambassador would automatically satisfy the members of the European Union. I should have thought that the events of yesterday would have shown that that was not always the case. But I believe that the representative of Spain wishes to respond on behalf of the European Union, and I very happily leave it to him to do so.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I am not sure under which rule I am responding, but this is certainly a question of right of reply. I did not think we were in rights of reply and explanations of vote, but that seems to be the case. Let me say immediately that I am delighted that my statement following the vote was listened to so carefully by a number of countries at which it was aimed. That is an extremely pleasing result.

Australia deeply regrets that some countries have not seen fit to commit themselves to binding non-proliferation commitments. We believe that such commitments are an essential and understandable requirement if we are going to see a global arrangement for full security assurances. May I also say that references to early years of the NPT's existence, a period more than 20 years ago, have little relevance to a situation now, with a regime commanding such international support that it is, I would argue, almost at the stage of becoming customary international law. Certainly, the provisions of the NPT are so widely accepted that they constitute a norm of international behaviour that those few countries that have not joined yet should well consider.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to reply on behalf of the European Union to the observations made by the representative of Pakistan in his statement yesterday. Let me note the undeniable fact that my statement was made with a specific date in mind: 14 November 1995. Therefore, we should not make references to a time in the past, to a time when the circumstances were very different from the present ones. Today's international community and international problems are very different from those of several years ago. The moment in history at which my statement was made is the present, a time at which the international community must address the basic problem of avoiding the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The best way to do this is through signature of the non-proliferation Treaty.

My delegation, on behalf of the countries of the European Union, stated its view yesterday that reference to that fact was lacking in the draft resolution.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, since you have ruled — curiously, in my view — that rights of reply are permitted during the voting and not at the end of the proceedings, I should like a brief right of reply to the representative of Pakistan.

I would simply say that careful reading of Security Council resolution 984 (1995) will show that it is the clear and precise policy of all five nuclear-weapon States that security assurances extended by those nuclear-weapon States reciprocate, and correspond to, the undertakings of the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to renounce nuclear weapons and place their nuclear capabilities and programmes under international safeguards. Now if Pakistan and India would like to have the assurances that are extended by the five nuclear-weapon States, the way is clear.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Since the representative of the United States has entered this dialogue, I should like briefly to respond to his remarks.

First of all, it is our view, and we believe that this view is supported by customary international law, that the possession of nuclear weapons is an aberration. Which law gives the five nuclear-weapon States the right to hold nuclear weapons in perpetuity? There is no such law. The very first resolution of the United Nations declared that nuclear weapons are weapon of mass destruction and should be prohibited. Therefore, it is the aberration of the possession of nuclear weapons by five States which must be rectified. And until that is rectified through nuclear disarmament and the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, these five States have an obligation — I repeat, they have an obligation — to assure the rest of us that they will not use these weapons against any of us.

The representative of the United States has said that their security assurances reciprocate obligations undertaken under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Does this mean that the United States holds out the threat of the use of nuclear weapons against those non-nuclear weapon States that are not parties to the NPT? This would be inconsistent with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The Charter says that the use of force, or the threat of use of force, by any means, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, is illegal. Therefore, the use, or threat of use of nuclear weapons *per se* is illegal, and it is against this threat that there must be security assurances. These security assurances must be provided to all non-nuclear-weapon States.

To ask us to accept the NPT as a condition higher to those security assurances amounts, I would submit, to nuclear blackmail.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I should like to take this opportunity to state the Chinese position on Security Council resolution 984 (1995).

China has consistently maintained that we should extend unconditional assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States on the use, or threat of use, in any circumstances and at any time, of nuclear weapons against them. These non-nuclear-weapon States, of course, include States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is precisely on the basis of this reasoning that China joined the other four nuclear-weapon States in proposing Security Council resolution 984 (1995).

Mr. Starr (Australia): I hesitate to intervene again. Let me make clear where Australia comes from. Our Foreign Minister has argued in The Hague, before the International Court of Justice, that if the Court decides to reach a decision on cases before it regarding nuclear weapons, it accepts that nuclear weapons are illegal. Possession, acquisition, use — illegal.

But I cannot leave unanswered the comments by my colleague from Pakistan. Let me put a question to him: Does the lack of commitment to non-proliferation on the part of his country represent a threat of possible acquisition of nuclear weapons to other States? I would also put to him, and to others, that the question of commitments does not require a State to join a particular Treaty; there are other ways for a State to express its commitment to non-proliferation.

In our statements, we have never made mandatory the sense that a State has to join a particular regime or not. What we are most concerned with is the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the fact that there be no further nuclear-weapon States, and that the nuclear weapons at present in existence be subject to a systematic programme of reduction towards their ultimate elimination so that we can achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world.

The Chairman: May I now appeal now to delegations. We devoted the first part of this morning's meeting to the continuation of last night's debate. I did not want to separate the explanation of vote or position after the vote from the rights of reply, only because I did not want to waste time. I simply wanted to gain some time and finish with the responses. We have already had a number of requests from various delegations, and I hope that they will keep their statements very short.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I have asked to speak only because the representative of Australia has addressed a direct question to me, and I should like to respond to him. I appreciate the spirit in which he has made those comments, and we appreciate Australia's position with regard to the illegality of nuclear weapons.

First of all, the fact that certain countries are not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) can arise from their peculiar circumstances. Australia knows full well the circumstances that Pakistan faces, and also knows the efforts we have made for non-proliferation in our region. Pakistan is therefore not apologetic about its position on non-proliferation. We have a consistent stand in favour of non-proliferation, but there are special reasons why we

have not ratified the NPT. But I submit to him that the self-restraint that has been exercised by my country is a fact, because we have not acted otherwise. We have accepted unilateral commitments on non-proliferation, and we have acted on those commitments.

Those commitments, I submit, should not be dismissed lightly by certain States and used to put pressure on us by various means. That is not a contribution to non-proliferation. We should work together to address non-proliferation problems in various parts of the world, taking account of the particular situations in those regions. You cannot paint all the problems of the world with a broad brush.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1; in cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1; in cluster 6, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33; in cluster 7, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1; in cluster 8, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12; in cluster 10, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30; and in cluster 11, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18. Action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 in cluster 11 must be deferred, as the statement of its financial implications is not yet ready.

After concluding its action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will take action on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2; in cluster 2, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, to which I shall return in a moment; in cluster 4, draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and L.40; and in cluster 8, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27.

The sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.13 and L.48 have asked the Chairman to defer action on those draft resolutions; with the consent of the Committee, action on those two draft resolutions will be deferred to a later date.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, the Secretariat informs me that the draft resolution has programme budget implications; the relevant document will be available tomorrow morning. But it is my understanding that the draft resolution will not involve financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): It was my understanding that we had agreed yesterday that the Committee would not take action today on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2. Is this not correct?

The Chairman: It was the understanding of the Chair that we would indeed be taking up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 this morning, but if delegations are not ready to take action on that draft resolution, we could, with the consent of the sponsor, defer it.

Mr. Bandura (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I would request that action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 be taken tomorrow morning as the first item of the day.

The Chairman: I propose, then, with the consent of the Committee, to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 until tomorrow.

Mr. Boros (Hungary): You have just informed the Committee, Sir, that you have information from the Secretariat that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 is without financial implications. My delegation is among the sponsors of this draft resolution. As this was among the first draft resolution to be submitted, some three weeks ago, I propose that action be taken on the draft resolution today, as had been decided yesterday.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): As you stated, Sir, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 has no implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. However, in a case such as this one, we would in certain circumstances read out a statement on the financial aspects of the text. In this instance, the Budget Division has seen fit to submit a document, which will be issued tomorrow as document A/C.1/50/L.59. I shall read out selected portions of that note by the Secretariat, and will try to refer to the relevant points.

> "2. The requests contained in operative paragraphs 3 and 5 are related to major programme 1, Maintenance of peace and security, disarmament and decolonization, programme 7, Disarmament, of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997, as revised. They are covered under section 2, Political affairs, subprogramme 1, Deliberation and negotiation, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997.

"3. Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, it is the understanding of the Secretary-General that Secretariat assistance and substantive support services would be required for its implementation.

"4. In addition, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, no modifications would be required in the activities under section 2, Political affairs, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997 as the activities to be undertaken under the draft resolution fall under programme 7, Disarmament, subprogramme 1, Deliberation and negotiation, activity 1, International cooperation, (a) depositary services." (*A/C.1/50/L.59, paras. 2, 3 and 4*)

With respect to assistance and services, I would point out that there are two major categories. The first is conference servicing costs, which amount to a total of $2,843,700 for the Fourth Review Conference and $176,300 for the Preparatory Committee.

As far as the non-conference services are concerned, there are two major aspects here: first, travel and daily subsistence allowance for three professionals and one general service staff from the Centre for Disarmament Affairs which would amount to $28,700 for the Fourth Review Conference and $15,200 for the Preparatory Committee. And secondly, one work month of temporary assistance will also be required, which would result in the expenditure of $4,200 for the Fourth Review Conference itself and, according to these figures, the grand total of those costs falling under conference-servicing and non-conference-servicing costs would amount to $2,876,600 for the Fourth Review Conference on Biological Weapons and $191,500 for the Preparatory Committee.

I will not read the entire text but I wish to refer to one or two more paragraphs.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 to provide the necessary assistance and required services for the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the Third Review Conference ... [and] the Special Conference, has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the conference of the Convention". ...

The "conference of the Convention" refers to the States parties. The reference is, of course, to the Special Conference on Biological Weapons and the Preparatory Committee.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions and treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance. It should be noted that costings are being provided for indicative purposes only and that the States parties to the Convention will have to bear the actual costs of holding the Conference and its Preparatory Committee meeting, which may be somewhat lower or higher than the estimated costs.

"Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997." (*A/C.1/50/L.59, paras. 7-9*)

All the details will appear in document A/C.1/50/L.59, to be issued tomorrow.

The Chairman: We have a proposal from the representative of Hungary to take action on the draft resolution today. If I hear no objection I will put the draft resolution to the vote today.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call on the representative of Ukraine to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2.

Mr. Bandura (Ukraine) *(interpretation from Russian)*: My delegation is speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, entitled "Contribution to nuclear disarmament" — namely Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Marshall Islands, Monaco and Ukraine.

I should like briefly to explain the reasons for the submission of this draft resolution. Over the last few years, the First Committee has adopted a number of consensus resolutions in which States have been called upon to make their contribution to the process of nuclear disarmament and to associate themselves with the various agreements and treaties which have been concluded in this area.

Following the principles contained in the proposal of the First Committee and approved by the General Assembly, and recognizing their responsibility for building a future of peace based on the absence of weapons of mass destruction, it was decided to confer non-nuclear status on States which had never possessed nuclear technology and which had voluntarily liquidated their nuclear programmes or had renounced the possession of nuclear weapons which they inherited after their proclamations of independence. Those States have all taken an important step towards achieving a nuclear-free world. In the view of the sponsors of the draft resolution, such actions must be properly reflected in the decision of such an important body as the United Nations. This is the basic idea underlying the draft resolution.

Recognizing the difficulties involved in nuclear problems and the interests of individual groups and States the sponsors of the draft resolution did everything possible to avoid controversial conceptual formulations. The draft resolution just notes facts and avoids any evaluation of decisions that have been taken.

In the first preambular paragraph reference is made to last year's resolutions in which States were called upon to continue their efforts in the field of nuclear disarmament with the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, adhering to and ratifying the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and adopting two important treaties in regard to nuclear disarmament — START I and START II.

Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution lists States which acceded to the NPT after the First Committee concluded its work last year. In paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 the Assembly would take note of the entry into force and implementation of START I and would welcome as major achievements in the sphere of nuclear disarmament the signing of the START II Treaty by the Russian Federation and the United States. In operational paragraph 5, the Assembly would welcome States which had voluntarily renounced their nuclear programmes and nuclear weapons and were thus making a significant contribution to disarmament and the strengthening of regional and global security.

As for my own country, the draft resolution simply welcomes the accession to the NPT of Ukraine — which at the time it proclaimed its independence, possessed the third largest nuclear potential, voluntarily gave it up, and also undertook to liquidate more than 1500 warheads which had belonged to the Russian Federation.

Thus, the draft resolution, which is really of a procedural nature, notes the implementation of the requirements set forth last year in two consensus resolutions and one adopted by an overwhelming majority with only one abstention. One of these resolutions was adopted y non-aligned countries, one by developed countries and the third by a country which had suffered from nuclear destruction.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50, though submitted by a country that often has a different policy in regard to disarmament, meets the requirements for adoption by consensus and we appeal to States to adopt it unanimously. Adopting this decision will, in our view, testify to the readiness of members of the First Committee to implement decisions already adopted and to their commitment to do so and will give our work a new forward-looking momentum.

Inasmuch as the revised text of the draft resolution — A/C.1/0/L.50/Rev.1 — was circulated only this morning and inasmuch as it contains certain drafting changes, we would like to give countries an opportunity to acquaint themselves with it and we would once again request the Chair to defer the adoption of a decision on the draft resolution to tomorrow morning as one of the items in the cluster on nuclear matters.

The Chairman: If there no other draft resolutions to be introduced I shall now call upon representatives wishing to make statements other than in explanation of vote.

I see there are none.

I shall therefore now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States will vote against on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". That draft resolution is an attempt to distort the historic result of the recent Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We all know that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 is a counter-draft to the Russian Federation-United States draft resolution on

bilateral nuclear arms negotiations — resolution A/C.1/50/L.35 — which was adopted yesterday by an overwhelming majority.

However, there are many significant differences between draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35 and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44. As opposed to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35, the draft resolution we are about to take action on avoids mentioning in any way the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and its sponsors refuse to welcome the accession to the NPT of Belarus, Kazakstan and Ukraine. How is it possible for this United Nations body, responsible for disarmament, not to welcome those accessions to the NPT?

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 purposely avoids any of the consensus language from the NPT decision on "Principles and Objectives". Language on general and complete disarmament is missing, and language on nuclear disarmament is rewritten and distorted to suit some non-NPT States.

Finally, there are parts of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 that are patently untrue. For example, in the eighth preambular paragraph it is claimed that the nuclear-weapon States have expressed determination to pursue systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons within a time-bound framework. I can assure you that the nuclear-weapon States have not said this. Where do those words come from? How they found their way into the Cartagena Final Document is not our business, but they are not words that were ever accepted and endorsed by the nuclear-weapon States.

We regret that this session of the First Committee is more contentious than recent past sessions. A vivid example is this case of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35 and A/C.1/50/L.44. The question before us, in our view, is whether an effort led by a small minority of non-NPT States should be permitted to distort, in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44; the results of the NPT Review and Extension Conference. The response of the United States delegation will be "No", and we urge all other NPT Parties to join us in pushing the red button on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1, "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1, "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakstan, Liechtenstein,

Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Tajikistan, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to 37, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation notes with regret that this year once again it has not been possible to adopt a single draft resolution on bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament by consensus, a subject of great importance to us, for quite understandable reasons.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1, basing themselves on the draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation and the United States of America, along with other countries, have omitted a number of important points, particular those relating to the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the accession to it of Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakstan as non-nuclear-weapon States.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 also includes provisions that are not in keeping with the agreement achieved at the Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and, moreover, even distorts the provisions of that agreement. For example, the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8 both reflect no more than wishful thinking on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolution. On that basis, it is difficult to build a realistic policy in this important matter.

For all those reasons we were compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Australia regrets that it was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, on "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament". Australia is firmly committed to a systematic process of nuclear disarmament, leading to the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons. We believe the strategic environment is such that a continued programme of balanced reductions in nuclear arsenals that takes into account the need for stable deterrence in the transitional period can now be realistically pursued.

We fully support the resolution's focus on the need for determined pursuit of the objective of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons through a systematic process. However, we were disappointed that a draft resolution dealing with so important a topic failed to make any explicit reference to a development of undeniable significance to the subject of the draft resolution, namely, the outcome of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The only reference to the commitments taken by the nuclear-weapon States at that Conference is an implicit and inaccurate one, in the eighth preambular paragraph. In our view, the neglect of reference to the NPT, which provides the only legal framework in which all five nuclear-weapon States are bound to the process of nuclear disarmament, renders the draft resolution unbalanced.

Mr. Richards (New Zealand): New Zealand also abstained on the text contained in document A/C.1/50/L.44 on bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament. It is well known that New Zealand supports such bilateral negotiations and has nuclear disarmament as one of its main aims in the matter of arms control. The best way to achieve these goals is by working towards consensus within the international community by taking proper account of major achievements accomplished on the way towards the desired aim.

New Zealand is disappointed that there have been two draft resolutions on this subject. It is unfortunate that the sponsors of the text that we have just voted on failed to take the opportunity that was available to them to support and co-sponsor a consensus measure that would have reflected the common aspirations of the international community.

At the same time, we very much regret that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 took no account of one of the year's major achievements in further extending controls on nuclear weapons, that is to say, the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is, in our view, unhelpful to survey what has been done and make recommendations about the future without reference to such an important step. With that decision, the parties to the Treaty — the overwhelming majority of the United Nations — made permanent the international community's rejection of nuclear weapons by accepting, as an ultimate goal, the complete elimination of such weapons.

My delegation also finds it unhelpful to suggest that the goals we all desire, including the one I have just mentioned, need be approached by the device of time-

bound frameworks. Time-lines are appropriate where a goal, or a step on the way to a goal, is attainable, and a spur is needed, but otherwise, they do not help the cause and may indeed make progress more difficult. There is no magic wand that can wave away, whether according to a time-bound framework or not, the problems we are all trying to overcome. There is no quick fix. Progress is made by hard, cooperative work, sometimes faster, sometimes slower, but always seeking a further positive step on the way and taking account of steps achieved. It is because this text lacked attention to such things that New Zealand recorded an abstention.

Ms. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44.

Japan, with its unique experience, honestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which would cause indescribable human suffering, should never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to the efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.44 encourages and supports the Russian Federation and the United States to give their nuclear disarmament efforts the highest priority in order to contribute to the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

My delegation understands that this draft resolution is not the product of coordination of the views of these two nuclear-weapon States. Japan, which seeks to promote nuclear disarmament by means of steady disarmament efforts, cannot regard the draft resolution as having been formulated on the basis of appropriate consideration and consultation, and therefore could not support it.

The Chairman: Before we move on the next draft resolution, I wish to inform the Committee that there is a possibility of continuing our meeting this afternoon. Conference services will be available. In case the First Committee is not able to finish with those draft resolutions on which we are supposed to take action today, we may have to convene another meeting this afternoon. Certainly it will be done with the consent of the Committee. Does the Committee agree to that procedure?

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I turn now to cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their vote or position on the draft resolutions contained in that cluster.

Mr. Neagu (Romania): The draft resolutions on conventional weapons reveal an increased preoccupation on the part of Member States with the excessive accumulation, use and traffic — both legal and illegal — of such weapons. The overall number of co-sponsors of these draft resolutions is impressive, covering practically all regions of the world. The required actions go from mere confidence-building measures to restrictions and even prohibitions on the use of certain conventional weapons, measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, and assistance to States affected by such illicit traffic to curb such illegal actions and collect illegally transferred arms.

The draft resolutions submitted for adoption refer to heavy and expensive weapons such as battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large-calibre artillery systems, attack helicopters, combat aircraft, warships, missiles and missile systems, as well as to small, light, and frequently cheap, arms, including anti-personnel land-mines that might cost only $3 to $7 each.

Romania is proud to have co-sponsored from the very outset the draft resolutions on transparency in armaments. My delegation subscribes fully to the statement of the Netherlands delegation — introducing the text in question — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 — in the Committee this year as well. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, which is the subject of this draft resolution, constitutes, as is underlined in the second paragraph of the preamble, an important step forward in the promotion of transparency in military matters. The report of the Secretary-General on the Register provides data on seven important categories of arms, as well as background information received from Member States, on a voluntary basis, regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures.

The returns provided by some 90 countries cover more than 90 per cent of the international weapons trade. We consider, however, that even those countries that do not export or import arms should make a "nil" report to indicate their commitment to the reporting mechanism.

Romania has consistently provided the required data, and it supports the inclusion, as mandatory returns, of data on military holdings and procurement through national

production. This will make the Register more complete and more useful.

We also join those who consider that, after several years, it is necessary to make an evaluation. We look forward to the report to be provided by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of experts to be convened in 1997 — as requested in the draft resolution — on the continued operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Members States and the Secretary-General's 1994 report on the subject, with a view to a decision at the fifty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly.

I call on all delegations to vote for this draft resolution.

My delegation is also a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.34 and A/C.1/50/L.45 regarding prohibitions or restrictions on, respectively, the use of certain conventional weapons and a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines. We welcome the adoption, by the recent Vienna Review Conference of the parties to the 1981 Convention on certain conventional weapons, of a new Protocol on blinding lasers. We hope that, at its resumed session next January, the Conference will be able to adopt an amended Protocol II significantly reducing the dangers caused by the indiscriminate use of land-mines, and contributing to the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land-mines.

We hope that both of these draft resolutions will be adopted without a vote.

Romania is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, on small arms, which was initiated by Japan and was so ably introduced by Ambassador Kurokochi. We also support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37, on measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29, on assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them.

Romania strictly respects all arms embargoes established by the United Nations Security Council, and it has taken all possible measures to prevent illegal exports of arms and military material.

Indeed, the excessive accumulation of small arms, as well as their chaotic — albeit illicit — transfer, is an aggravating factor in regional conflicts, creating tension in times of peace. But no particular measures have yet been taken to combat such negative developments in the international arena. As is rightly stated in the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, arms obtained though the illicit arms trade are most likely to be used for violent purposes, and even small arms, when obtained, directly or indirectly, by terrorist groups, drug traffickers or underground organizations, can pose a danger to regional and international security, and certainly to the security and political stability of the countries affected.

A study prepared by the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of qualified governmental experts, will be of great value, helping us to identify principles and criteria to be followed by States in considering international transfers of small and other conventional arms, as well as ways and means of preventing or reducing the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of such arms, taking particular account of the way in which they cause or exacerbate conflict.

My delegation noted with interest the proposal of the International Committee of the Red Cross that small-arms transfers be reflected in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

Romania hopes to collaborate further with the numerous countries sponsoring these draft resolutions on conventional weapons — indeed, with all States Members of the United Nations — in order to promote and realize the noble and constructive objective of the proposals that they contain. In this sense, we consider that some work can be done both at the Conference on Disarmament — in the Ad Hoc Committee on Transparency in Armaments — and at the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

I call on delegations to support all these draft resolutions.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to make a statement? Apparently not.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. Volski (Georgia): Georgia is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, which is entitled "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms".

Like many other States, Georgia has itself felt the destructive force of evil that conventional weapons are

capable of inflicting when they are at the disposal of extremist forces and terrorists.

The Chairman: I apologize to the representative of Georgia for having to point out that, under the rules of procedure, a sponsor of a draft resolution is not allowed to explain its vote on that draft resolution. A sponsoring delegation is supposed to make its statement at the "statement" stage of the debate on the cluster.

Mr. Volski (Georgia): I approached the Secretariat with regard to this matter, and my name was included in the list. When I heard you call me, Mr. Chairman, I was obliged to speak.

The Chairman: Very well. I shall call on the representative of Georgia, not for an explanation of vote but for a general statement on cluster 3.

Mr. Volski (Georgia): Like many other States, Georgia has itself felt the destructive force of evil that conventional weapons are capable of inflicting when they are at the disposal of extremist forces and terrorists. Great material damage has been inflicted on many States. To recover from such damage and overcome the consequences of this evil, a State requires great financial resources.

My Government calls upon all States to act responsibly by supporting this draft resolution. In making this call, it is joining the many people whose lives have been blighted by injury and those who are still being maimed by the war. We believe that it is very important that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to make a statement?

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): The delegation of Sri Lanka is among those that have co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, on measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms.

Sri Lanka, in this forum and elsewhere, has taken a consistent stand on the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, the practice of which has been on the increase, with devastating consequences for the national security of States in all parts of the world, particularly small and vulnerable countries. The situation has been aggravated in recent years by the availability of huge quantities of conventional weapons, released by the end of the cold war. A disturbing development in this respect is the impact of activities of this nature on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States affected.

Another area of serious concern to my delegation is the increasing tendency to recruit, either by force or through enticement, child soldiers, sometimes as young as 10 years of age, equip them with illicitly obtained weapons and use them to wage secessionist wars and conduct terrorist activities, in total disregard of the interests of such children. The seriousness of the situation compelled the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka to raise this issue at the current session of the General Assembly.

In view of this situation, my delegation fully shares the views expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1 and expresses the hope that it will be adopted by the First Committee and the General Assembly with the widest possible majority.

My delegation also hopes that, pursuant to operative paragraph 3, Member States would take follow-up action by expressing their views concerning measures at national, regional and international levels to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional weapons.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I shall be extremely brief. I should like just to read out the names of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Afghanistan at the 16th meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1995, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Bhutan, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Turkmenistan and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am making this statement on behalf of the European Union and also of the following countries: Argentina, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. The member States of the European Union joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, in view of their general support for measures to curb the illicit traffic in, and use of, conventional arms.

With respect to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the member States of the European Union wish to affirm that they adhere strictly to all the arms embargoes that have been imposed by the Security Council and the European Union, and that they are adopting all possible measures to prevent the illicit export of arms and military *materiel*.

The Chairman: The Committee will now move on to cluster 6.

We will take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.33.

I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am making this statement on behalf of the European Union and the following countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

I am speaking on behalf of the European Union to explain to the Committee why the members of the Union will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33.

This change from a positive vote to an abstention on the text as a whole is explained by the fact that the draft resolution submitted to our Committee this year is practically the same as the resolutions on the subject adopted over the last two years, though the arms race in outer space ceased to exist when the cold war ended. The members of the European Union believe that henceforth it is indispensable to change the draft resolution substantially, since we can no longer consider that it reflects the current international situation by insisting as it does on positions which cannot, as experience has shown, receive widespread support from the international community.

In the opinion of the European Union, the draft resolution should be considerably abridged and made to focus essentially on the one element that can be sure of the support of the international community with regard to the military use of space, namely, the negotiation of confidence-building measures in space. The European Union has every confidence that the traditional sponsors of the draft resolution will in the future take into account the need to modify the text so that it can attract broader support from the international community on a subject the importance of which is recognized by all.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, curiously entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". We will abstain for several reasons, the most important of which is the language in operative paragraph 8, in which the Conference on Disarmament is requested to prepare for negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement to prevent an arms race in outer space.

We have previously pointed out that there is no arms race in outer space today. This positive circumstance can be attributed to the legal agreements already in existence. Those same agreements also serve to prevent a future arms race. Consequently, the negotiation of any additional agreements is not required. Accordingly, the United States does not agree with the fifteenth preambular paragraph or with operative paragraph 8 regarding negotiations on measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, nor do we agree with the statement in the nineteenth preambular paragraph that the fundamental task of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate such an agreement.

In addition, because of changes in the global security environment, and since there is no arms race, there is no foundation for the claim in the seventh preambular paragraph that it represents a grave danger for international peace and security.

Finally, I would like to note in passing that the twelfth preambular paragraph incorrectly indicates that an Ad Hoc Committee continued the examination and identification of various issues, and so on. The fact is that there was no such Ad Hoc Committee in 1995.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting. Separate recorded votes have been requested on the nineteenth paragraph of the preamble and on operative paragraphs 8 and 10.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Ukraine.

The Committee will first vote on the nineteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The nineteenth paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 was retained by 99 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South

Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 was retained by 100 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 was retained by 91 votes to 1, with 63 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, as a whole, was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 46 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", as a whole. In our view, the most promising area of activity for the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space remains the production of concrete proposals on confidence-building and better information on the part of those carrying out activities in outer space.

In that connection, the Ad Hoc Committee has received studies and proposals from various countries. We should point out, however, that the draft resolution submitted at this session does not fully reflect the realities of today's world. We do not, therefore, consider it timely to urge my country and the United States of America to resume their bilateral negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement for preventing an arms race in outer space, negotiations which in the past resulted in the START I Agreement, as does operative paragraph 10. The Russian delegation was therefore compelled to abstain in the separate vote on that paragraph.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, in cluster 7.

I call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Amran (Malaysia): My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to explain its position prior to the Committee's taking action on the important item before us today on the question of expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

We truly appreciate the initiative taken by the delegation of South Africa and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 in bringing once again to the Committee's attention this important issue, one that is of particular interest to my delegation and to many others here as well. My delegation supports this draft resolution.

At the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, in 1978, we agreed to establish the Conference on Disarmament. Since then, the Conference on Disarmament has been the single, most-important, global disarmament negotiating forum committed to promoting general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

However, since its establishment the Conference has been a kind of exclusive club of only a few Member States. For two consecutive sessions, in resolutions 48/77 B of 16 December 1993 and 49/77 B of 15 December 1994, we urged the Conference on Disarmament to make every effort to reach a solution resulting in a significant expansion of its composition, which would then include at least sixty countries.

We were, however, disappointed that when the Conference decided at its 719th plenary meeting on 21 September 1995 to review its membership, it extended membership to only 23 countries out of 35 that had applied. Even those 23 countries have yet to assume their membership until the Conference decides on a date.

Malaysia has a particular interest in becoming a member of this important subsidiary organ of the United Nations. Malaysia applied for membership in the Conference on Disarmament on 2 September 1993. Given our significant interest in and strong commitment to playing an active role in the international community's efforts towards international peace and security, and in particular its efforts to promote general and complete disarmament, my delegation strongly urges that Malaysia's application, together with those of the other candidates to date, should be given serious consideration by the Conference on Disarmament as a matter of the highest priority.

Membership in the Conference on Disarmament is, we believe, the legitimate aspiration of all applicants that have already expressed their desire to join it. We strongly urge the Conference on Disarmament to consider, on an urgent basis, the remaining candidates to date, and we are very hopeful that that will result in an early and positive decision.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995, and is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of their position.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 regarding expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. The United States is a long-time supporter of expanding the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, dating back to the early 1980s. While the Conference on Disarmament has failed many times in the past to find consensus to expand its membership, we continue to believe that the time is right to make the composition of the Conference on Disarmament more reflective of the changing international environment. In operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 the Conference on Disarmament is urged, at the start of its 1996 session, to implement the decision contained in document CD/1356.

I would like to remind colleagues that the United States stands ready to implement CD/1356 as soon as possible. We can take a decision in the Conference on Disarmament when we return to Geneva at the end of this month or early in December, or we could take a decision early in January before the 1996 session of the Conference on Disarmament even begins. In this regard, the United States reiterates its proposal of 21 September contained in document CD/1362, which states that all those on the O'Sullivan list can assume together membership of the Conference as long as the Conference, at the same time, decides that any State member of the Conference on Disarmament which is subject to comprehensive enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter would not have the right to deny consensus on any decision otherwise acceptable to all other members of the Conference. The United States welcomes the support that our proposal has received from many in the Conference on Disarmament and we would point out that the proposal contained in our document CD/1362 is the only one before us which could implement promptly the September decision to admit all those States on the O'Sullivan list.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation has long been of the firm view, taking into account various points and arguments about the issue, that the Conference on Disarmament can benefit from expansion of its membership. We agree also with arguments and reasons cited in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 in favour of expansion of the membership. Indeed, there are a number of countries that can and, I am sure, will continue to contribute to the work of the Conference usefully and substantially through such expansion. In the light of this, we agreed to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 here and we shall continue to support in earnest and promote the expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament and endeavour to seek the best possible way to achieve this. We wish to stress in this

regard, and in regard to the decision of the Conference, whose implementation is urged in operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, that there exists a real possibility for expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament by the time it begins its work in 1996. This requires examination of those proposals submitted at the Conference on Disarmament or other possible future proposals which provide a reasonable approach that permits the expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament immediately and specifically at the start of the 1996 session of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan was happy to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1. We have long favoured the balanced expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament to better reflect the realities of the current world. We very much regret that the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to approve the so-called O'Sullivan list for the past two years, owing unfortunately to the position taken by one delegation. We agree with the statement in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution that the Conference on Disarmament should implement its decision contained in document CD/1356 on an urgent basis. We hope that this can happen when the Conference on Disarmament reconvenes in January 1996. I must state, however, that it is the position of my delegation and, we understand, of several others, that no conditions or arbitrary limitations should be imposed on sovereign States.

The Chairman: Would there be any other delegation wishing to explain its vote? There seems to be none. ...

I call on the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. Kim (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I just want to know something. It is a different question. We originally co-sponsored the draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21 but there was no mention here of our country. I want to know why.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee for a clarification.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Apparently the name was omitted inadvertently and, of course, with the Committee's concurrence, it will be reinstated.

The Chairman: In view of the lateness of the hour, we will have to continue our work this afternoon at 3 p.m., as we agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.